

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION

FRANCIS KEISTER,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	NO. 3:20-cv-00990
)	
v.)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
)	
AMAZONCOM, INC., et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

ORDER

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 19), recommending that Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 14) be granted. No Objections to the Report and Recommendation have been filed.¹

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at *2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at *1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*,

¹ Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal twelve days after the Report and Recommendation was filed. (Doc. No. 20). The Court entered an Order explaining to Plaintiff that the appeal was premature and gave Plaintiff an additional 21 days to respond to the Report and Recommendation, as Plaintiff seemed to misunderstand the process for objecting to the Report and Recommendation. (Doc. No. 21). Instead of thereafter properly objecting, Plaintiff attempted to pay the filing fee associated with her notice of appeal. (Doc. No. 22). The Court ordered the money refunded to Plaintiff. (Doc. No. 23). No objections have been filed regarding the Report and Recommendation.

No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at *3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. Id.

Nonetheless, the Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation and the file. The Report and Recommendation is adopted and approved. Accordingly, Defendant's Motion to Dismiss (Doc. No. 14) is GRANTED. This action is DISMISSED with prejudice, and the Clerk is directed to close the file. This Order shall constitute the final judgment in this case under Fed. R. Civ. P. 58.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE